DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 405 426 UD 031 584

AUTHOR Weiler, Jeanne
TITLE Project Return and Babygram Hospital Outreach, 1993-94.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Educational Research.
PUB DATE Sep 94
NOTE 71p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Continuation Students; Counseling; Dropout Prevention; *Dropout Programs; Dropouts; *Early Parenthood; Program Evaluation; *Reentry Students; Secondary Education; Social Services; *Student Placement; Urban Schools; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS Case Management; New York (New York); New York City Board of Education; *Project Return NY

ABSTRACT

Project Return, a dropout recovery program to assist pregnant and parenting teenagers and parents of elementary school children to return to school, was first implemented in 1989-90, and by 1993-94 had expanded to serve 19 sites in New York City. The Babygram Hospital Outreach program, an outgrowth of Project Return, operated in 12 hospitals and health facilities to target pregnant and parenting teenagers at risk of dropping out. Both components used a case management approach, allocating an educational case manager to each site to recruit and counsel participants, coordinate educational alternatives, make referrals and placements, and track program participants. Evaluators from the New York City Board of Education's Office of Educational Research (OER) collected data on 278 program participants and referrals made along with pretest and posttest data on self-esteem and parenting skills from a smaller sample of participants. In addition, OER conducted a longitudinal study of Babygram clients. Data indicated that case managers were successful in meeting the program goal of identifying parents needing services and in recruiting them into the program and placing them. The longitudinal study indicated that 59% of Babygram participants graduated or were still enrolled. Because of the lack of pretest and posttest matches, it was not possible to document program effects on self-esteem, but it appeared that program participation was associated with higher levels of self confidence and parenting knowledge. Recommendations are made for program improvement. Four appendixes contain tables of data about dropouts and program referrals. (Contains 16 tables and 4 appendix tables.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 405 426

PROJECT RETURN AND BABYGRAM HOSPITAL OUTREACH 1993-94

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jeanne Weiler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD031584

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Carol A. Gresser
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Louis DeSario
Sandra E. Lerner
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra-Vélez
William C. Thompson, Jr.
Members

Tiffany Raspberry
Student Advisory Member

Ramon C. Cortines
Chancellor

8/94

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is the policy of the Board of Education of the City School District of the City of New York not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, and to maintain an environment free of sexual harassment, as required by law. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may be directed to Frederick A. Hill, Jr., Director (Acting), Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201, Telephone: (718) 935-3320

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Return, a dropout recovery program to assist pregnant and parenting teenagers and parents of elementary school children to return to school, was first implemented during the 1989-90 school year. By 1993-94, the program had expanded to 19 sites throughout New York City. Based on the original design, the program consisted of two components. Project Return operated in six elementary schools and one family center in four boroughs and targeted elementary school parents who had not completed their education. The Babygram Hospital Outreach component operated in 12 hospitals or health facilities and targeted pregnant and parenting teenagers who had dropped out of school or were at risk of dropping out because of pregnancy or parenting responsibilities. Both components utilized a case management approach, allocating an educational case manager to each site who recruited and counseled participants, coordinated educational alternatives, made educational referrals and placements, and tracked program participants.

OER evaluators collected demographic data on program participants and educational referrals and placements from a sample of case managers' individual files. The program director's office supplied OER with aggregated monthly statistics on program activities. In addition, pre- and post-test data on self-esteem and parenting skills were collected on a sample of parent participants. Finally, OER conducted a longitudinal study of Babygram teen clients who were referred to public high schools through the on-line database of New York City public school children.

Demographic data indicated that the case mangers were successful in meeting the program goal of identifying parents of elementary school children who had not completed high school and pregnant and parenting teens who had dropped out of school or were at risk of dropping out. At the time of the intake, three-fourths of the program parents had not completed high school; however, the majority had completed tenth or eleventh grade putting them relatively close to graduation. Approximately two-thirds of Babygram teen clients had dropped out of school. The majority of teens who had dropped out completed no more than ninth grade. The educational status of new program participants has remained constant since 1991.

The educational case managers at both the Return schools and the Babygram hospital sites were successful in recruiting participants and placing them in educational settings. Although the average number of new intakes in both program components did not surpass the previous year, case managers were more successful in placing clients in educational settings than in previous program years.

OER obtained information on end-of-year outcomes for 99 percent of the Return sample parents and 91 percent of the Babygram sample teen clients. For participants in both program components, end-of-year outcomes have remained fairly constant over the three program years.

In a longitudinal study of three cohorts of Babygram teen clients who were referred by case managers to New York City public high schools, OER determined that the majority of teens, (59 percent) have either graduated or were still enrolled in school.

OER also attempted to measure gains in self-esteem and parenting skills of parents who participated in Project Return workshops and activities at Return elementary schools. Because of the lack of pre- and post-test matches, OER could not determine mean gains. However, using comparison data, it did appear that participation in Project Return is associated with higher levels of self-confidence and parenting knowledge. OER also compared the academic achievement of children of Project Return parents and non-project parents and found that program participation had a significant effect on program parents' childrens' academic achievement.

Based on the findings of this evaluation, OER recommends the following:

- Given the success educational case managers have had in placing clients in educational settings, Project Return should review its recruitment processes in order to increase the number of new clients to be served.

- Project Return should expand its program of formal training for case managers to enable them to meet the many and complex needs of their clients.

- Project Return should explore ways to better plan, implement, and evaluate additional program components such as staff development activities and participant enrichment workshops.

- Project Return should strengthen its relationships with school staff in New York City public high schools, particularly those that enroll the most Babygram teen clients since clients experience many difficulties in making the transition to school life and may need a variety of additional services.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report has been prepared by the High School Evaluation Unit, Office of Educational Research (OER), of the Board of Education of the City of New York under the direction of Dr. Lori Mei. Jeanne Weiler served as project coordinator for this evaluation and wrote the report. Jan Rosenblum analyzed the data.

Additional copies of this report are available by writing to:

Dr. Lori Mei
Evaluation Manager
Office of Educational Research
110 Livingston Street, Rm. 740
Brooklyn, New York 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
	LIST OF TABLES	vi
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background	1
	Program Components and Target Populations	2
	Objectives of the Study	3
	Evaluation Methodology	5
	Scope of This Report	6
II.	PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS	7
	Project Return Sites	7
	Project Return Participants	8
	Project Return Activities	11
	Babygram Hospital Outreach Sites	14
	Babygram Program Participants' Educational Status	14
	Babygram Recruitment	17
	Babygram Program Activities	19
III.	EDUCATIONAL REFERRALS AND PLACEMENTS	20
	Return Participants	20
	Babygram Participants	24
IV.	PROGRAM OUTCOMES	29
	Project Return Educational Placement Outcomes	29
	Project Return Program Impacts	31
	Babygram Hospital Outreach Educational Placement Outcomes	38
	Babygram Teen Longitudinal Study	41
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	47
	APPENDICES	
	A Frequency of High Schools Last Attended by Teens Who Dropped out, by Superintendency	50
	B Frequency of N.Y.C. Public High Schools Where Teens Were Actively Attending At the Time of Intake, by High School Superintendency	53

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDICES

C Frequency of N.Y.C. Public High Schools Teens Were Referred to, by High School Superintendency 56

D Frequency of N.Y.C. Public High Schools Teens Enrolled in After Referral by a Case Manager, by Superintendency 58

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Comparison of Mean Number of Monthly Intakes, by Return Site, 1993-94	10
2	Number and Percent of Social Service Referrals to Return Parents, by Type	12
3	School Attendance Status of Babygram Teens, by Highest Grade Completed	16
4	Comparison of Mean Number of Monthly Intakes, by Babygram Site, 1993-94	18
5	Number and Percent of Return School Parents Placed in Educational Programs and on Waiting Lists, by Type of Program	21
6	Percentage Ratios of Return Parents Enrolled in On-Site vs. Off-site Educational Programs	23
7	Number and Percent of Educational Referrals in Babygram Population Data, by Program Type	26
8	Comparison of Placement Rates, by Type of Program 1991-92, 1992-93, and 1993-94	28
9	Year-End Summary of Reported Outcomes for a Sample of Return Parents Enrolled in an Educational Program	30
10	Project Return Parents' Self-Esteem and Locus of Control End-of-Year Mean Scores	33
11	Comparison of Pre-Test Mean PAAT Scores	36
12	Comparison of Spring 1993 Reading and Mathematics N.C.E.s of Students of Project Return Parents and Non-Return Parents	39
13	Comparison of Spring 1993 Reading and Mathematics N.C.E.s of Students of Project Return Parents and Non-Return Parents	40
14	Year-end Summary of Reported Outcomes for Babygram Sample, 1991-92, 1992-93, and 1993-94	42

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
15	Year-end Outcomes of Babygram Teens, by Type of Referral, 1993-94	43
16	Educational Status of Babygram Teens for Three Years, 1990-91, 1991-92, 1992-93	45

I. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Project Return, a program to assist pregnant and parenting teenagers and parents of elementary school children to return to school, was implemented during the 1989-90 school year as a result of a series of recommendations set forth by the Chancellor's Working Group on Educational Opportunities for Pregnant and Parenting Adolescents.* Under the administration of the Program for Pregnant and Parenting services, Alternative High Schools and Programs, Project Return was first implemented in eight sites in New York City. Beginning in September 1991, with funding provided by the U.S. Department of Education, School Dropout Demonstration Assistance program, Project Return expanded to an additional seven sites. By 1993-94, the program had extended to 19 sites throughout New York City.

Based on data provided by the Alan Guttmacher Institute,** more than one million teenagers (one in nine young women aged 15 to 19 years old) become pregnant each year and over 50 percent of those pregnancies result in birth. Moreover, one in five girls who have a premarital pregnancy will become pregnant again within a year and 31 percent within two years. In New York City, it is

---

*Chancellor's Working Group on Educational Opportunities for Pregnant and Parenting Adolescents, Helping Pregnant and Parenting Students Complete High School in New York City (New York: Board of Education, Office of Alternative High Schools and Special Programs, June 1989). The Working Group was comprised of public agency officials, service providers, advocates, educators, and students, and was convened by the Chancellor on October 11, 1988.

**Allan Guttmacher Institute: Factsheet on Teenage Sexual and Reproductive Behavior, March 15, 1993.

a year and 31 percent within two years. In New York City, it is estimated that more than 28,000 girls between the ages of 10 and 17 become pregnant every year.* Because of pregnancy and parenting responsibilities, it is estimated that 25 percent of these girls will eventually drop out of school before completing their high school education. In addition, many mothers who remain in school are below grade level and at risk of dropping out of school. Without intervention, these students might experience curtailed education and limited employment opportunities. Moreover, the socio-economic and educational disadvantages for teen mothers can have devastating and often life-long consequences for their children.

Since its inception in 1989, Project Return, a dropout recovery program, has targeted pregnant and parenting teenagers and parents of young school children who have not completed their education, and provided them with assistance and support to re-enter or enroll in educational settings.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS AND TARGET POPULATIONS

Project Return is a dual component dropout recovery program. One component, Project Return,** operated in six elementary schools and one Family Center, and served parents of all ages who have not completed high school. The other component, Babygram

---

*New York Department of Health, 1991.

**In some cases, the name Project Return refers to both components of the program. At other times Project Return refers only to that component that serves parents of elementary school children and operates in elementary schools.

Hospital Outreach, operated in 12 hospitals or health facilities and targeted pregnant/parenting teenagers who had dropped out of school or were at risk of dropping out of school because of parenting responsibilities. Both components utilized a case management approach, allocating an educational case manager to each site who recruited and counseled participants, coordinated educational alternatives, made educational referrals and placements, and tracked program participants. Project Return had a full staff complement: a project supervisor, a project coordinator, seven certified teachers (Return educational case managers), and 12 family assistants (Babygram educational case managers).

The Program for Pregnant and Parenting Services requested that the Office of Educational Research (OER) examine program implementation and program outcomes. The evaluation encompassed seven Project Return sites and 12 Babygram Hospital Outreach sites.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

OER designed this evaluation to determine the program's progress toward meeting its goal of assisting parents of elementary school children and pregnant/parenting teens towards completing their education. Some of the issues examined in this study include participant needs and profiles, Project Return's range of activities, the delivery of services and, selected year-end outcomes. OER also assessed Project Return's success in

meeting its general goals and objectives. Together with program administrators, OER established the following objectives:

Project Return

- At least 30 percent of all program participants will remain in an educational program for at least one month.
- Program participants will demonstrate an increase in knowledge related to child development and child management as measured by comparison of pre- and post-test results on a standardized parenting questionnaire.
- As a result of participating in the program, participants will demonstrate an increase in self-esteem.
- At least 15 parent activities will take place at each site.
- The parent leadership and empowerment training component will be implemented as evidenced by copies of training activities, agendas, workshops, attendance lists or lesson plans.
- The Family Science component will be implemented at all sites.

Babygram Hospital Outreach Program

- The percentage of pregnant and parenting adolescents served by the project will be higher than the percentage served during the previous year.
- The percentage of pregnant and parenting adolescents referred to educational settings will be greater than the percentage referred the previous year.
- The percentage of pregnant and parenting adolescents placed in educational settings will be greater than the percentage placed the previous year.
- Fifteen hospital staff members will have received training in parenting skills conducted by Bank Street College of Education.
- Each hospital staff member trained by the Bank Street College of Education will implement at least one parenting activity or workshop for project participants.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The findings pertaining to this evaluation conducted in 1993-94 are based on a variety of data sources. The program director's office provided OER with quantitative data in the form of aggregated monthly statistics on program activities such as the number of new intakes, and, educational and social service referrals and placements. In addition, an OER evaluator provided training to case managers on how to select a 20 percent sample of participants for evaluation purposes and record quantitative data from the sample using individual case files.* Data from the sample yielded in-depth information on individual participants.

OER also carried out a number of other evaluation activities. To measure gains in self-esteem and parenting skills, OER provided Return case managers with standardized pre- and post-test questionnaires to administer to Return parents at the beginning and end of the program year. In addition, to measure the impact of program participation on the children of Project Return parents, OER compared reading and mathematics scores of children whose parents received Project Return services and children whose parents did not receive services. Finally, to conduct a longitudinal study of Babygram teen clients who were referred to various New York City public schools and programs between 1990 and 1993, OER tracked three cohorts of teens through the on-line database of New York City public school children.

---

*Return case managers also provided data from a 20-percent sample of the previous program year's participants.

Throughout this evaluation, OER has adhered to strict standards to protect the privacy of parent participants and their children and, pregnant and parenting students.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report describes the range of Project Return activities planned and carried out at each of the Return elementary schools and the Babygram Hospital Outreach sites, as well as educational case management referral and placement processes, and selected outcomes. Chapter I provides a short description of the two program components and presents an overview of the methodology used in this study. Program descriptions which include program sites, activities, and participants are presented in Chapter II. Educational referrals and placements are discussed in Chapter III followed by program outcomes in Chapter IV. Conclusions and recommendations are set forth in Chapter V. Appendices provide listings of the New York City public high schools that program clients most frequently attended, dropped out of, were referred to and re-enrolled in.

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

PROJECT RETURN SITES

Project Return operated in six elementary schools referred to in this report as Return schools and one Family Center (high school for pregnant and parenting teens). All of the elementary schools were New York State-funded community schools that provide pre-kindergarten and full-day kindergarten classes and a wide range of social, health, educational, and recreational services on an extended school-day and school-year basis. Two Return schools, P.S. 25 in Brooklyn and P.S. 126 in Manhattan, began their programs in 1989; P.S. 332 in Brooklyn started operations in 1990; P.S. 50 in the Bronx was added as a Return school in 1991; P.S. 105 in Queens began operating as a Return school during the 1992-93 school year; the Return program was implemented at P911 (Family Center) in Manhattan at the start of the 1993-94 school year; and a new site, P.S. 167 became fully operational by Spring 1994. In addition, Project Return has been running at a satellite site in Brooklyn since 1992-93, but for the purposes of this report it has not been included.

In general, most Return schools offered a variety of programs and services to parents, children, and community members which included parent training workshops, General Education Diploma (G.E.D.) programs for adults, English as a Second Language (E.S.L.) training, Adult Basic Education (ABE) classes, and pre-kindergarten and daycare programs.

Each Project Return site was staffed by a case manager (formerly a classroom teacher) whose primary goal was to recruit parents and assist them in enrolling in educational programs. In some cases, case managers provided direct educational services and parent training, acted as parent advocates at each of the Return schools, and carried out a number of supportive functions to help parents receive appropriate social services by intervening when necessary.*

PROJECT RETURN PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

OER utilized case managers' records to collect demographic information on a sample of parents served by Project Return during 1992-93 and 1993-94. The sample included 278 parents from seven Return sites.

The demographic data indicated that the case managers were successful in meeting the goal of identifying parents who had not completed high school. At the time of intake, three fourths (74 percent, N=198) had not completed high school, although 50 percent (N=135) of those parents had completed tenth or eleventh grade, putting them relatively close to graduation. Slightly over a quarter (26 percent, N=70) of program participants had completed high school indicating that they were entering the program for needs other than education or seeking help in enrolling in post-secondary institutions. The educational level of parents making contact with Project Return case managers has

*For a detailed description of case managers' responsibilities and activities, see previous Project Return evaluation reports.

remained fairly constant over the past three program years. However, the percentage of parents employed either full or part-time has decreased from the previous years. While one-third of the parents were employed during the previous program years, only 16 percent (N=44) were employed at the time of intake during the 1993-94 program year.

All case managers were required to submit monthly summaries of the number of new client intakes at their sites to the program office. Based on these statistics, case managers reported a total of 806 new intakes for 1993-94 (506 in the fall and 300 in spring). Table 1 shows that the average number of intakes a month ranged from six (a new site) to 23 (the longest-running site). This range of the average number of intakes per month has remained fairly consistent. It must be noted that case managers in well-established sites continue to serve many parents year after year since it takes time to help parents sort out the multiple problems in their lives before enrolling in an educational program. This means that Return case managers' case loads increase from year to year even if the number of new clients is not increasing.

During the initial intake interview, case managers assessed each parents' needs and goals and noted them on the intake form. Making referrals to meet clients' needs was a complex process. As mentioned, a number of parents were not yet able to go back to school because of multiple problems in their lives. Case managers explained that they must first deal with parents' health

Table 1

Comparison of Mean Number of Monthly Intakes by Return Site, 1993-94

Site	Average Monthly Intakes[a] Fall 1993	Spring 1994	Average for Year
P.S. 25K	35	14	23
C.S. 50X	21	16	18
P.S. 105Q	21	6	12
P911M	20	6	12
P.S. 167K[b]	--	6	6
P.S. 332K	16	9	12
P.S. 126M	13	3	8
Average Number of Intakes per Site	21	9	14

[a]The mean number of monthly intakes is derived by averaging the number of new intakes for October through January (fall 1993) and February through June (spring 1994).

[b]The case manager at P.S. 25 also ran a new Return site at P.S. 167 which was fully operative by Spring 1994.

- Return case managers had, on average, 21 new intakes per month during the fall, and 9 intakes per month during the spring.
- As expected, there were far more intakes during the fall, at the start of the school year, than during the spring.

and social service issues before assisting them in their return to an educational setting. Accordingly, the case managers made referrals to social service agencies that were in a position to take care of clients' needs for daycare, income maintenance, counseling, medical care, family planning, legal aid, and housing for example. On average, case managers made three social service contacts (arranged for appointments, obtained information, etc.) for each Return parent. (See Table 2 for actual number of referrals).

PROJECT RETURN PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

The seven Return sites hosted a number of workshops and activities throughout 1993-94. As required by the program office, case managers maintained a log of program activities and participants' attendance at those activities. According to information provided by the program office, over 200 workshops were conducted during the year attended by 2,660 participants--an average of 31 workshops per site and 13 participants per workshop. The average of 31 workshops per site far surpasses the program objective stating that at least 15 parent activities will take place at each site.

Case managers reported a variety of workshops and activities. In addition to attending educational classes (G.E.D., ABE, literacy, etc.), parents attended workshops that centered mainly on parenting skills, involvement in children's education, physical and emotional well-being, community issues, and recreational activities. In order to assess the

Table 2

Number and Percent of Social Service Referrals to Return Parents, by Type

Type of Referral	Referrals N	Referrals %
Human Resources Administration[a]	104	29
Medical	126	35
Counseling (family and personal)	70[b]	20
Housing	49	14
Rehabilitation (alcohol and drug)	9	3
Total Referrals	358[c]	101

[a]Human Resources Administration (H.R.A.) is a city agency that oversees welfare (including income maintenance and general social services), child protective services, and homelessness.

[b]This number includes 51 parents placed in counseling and 19 placed on waiting lists.

[c]Parents could be referred for more than one type of social intervention.

- Overall, Return case managers made 358 social service referrals for parents during the program year.

effectiveness of parenting skills workshops, the Parent as a Teacher Test (PAAT) was administered to parents and findings from this test are reported in the chapter on outcomes.

In addition, Return schools hosted a ten-week parent leadership training component provided by the City University of New York (CUNY) Parent Leadership Project, which offered training and assistance to parents who wanted to become leaders in their schools and to be more involved in their children's education. The Family Science Enrichment program, a ten-week after-school hands-on science program for parents and their children was also implemented in four Return sites. An attempt was made this year to expand the Family Science program to additional sites through a program modification calling for the training of parents (who had participated the previous year in the science enrichment program) to become workshop facilitators.

The implementation of both the Parent Leadership and Family Science components satisfied the Return objectives which stipulated that both programs be implemented for 1993-94. However, the Family Science program was not carried out for the full ten weeks and, although an evaluation was planned, the premature end to the program prohibited any post-program follow-up. OER was also unable to assess the impact of the the Parent Leadership component on Return participants because of the small number of pre-and post-tests (N=8) made available to OER by CUNY Parent Leadership project staff.

BABYGRAM HOSPITAL OUTREACH SITES

The Babygram Hospital Outreach program operated in 12 hospitals.* Four of the sites were located in Manhattan hospitals (Bellevue, Columbia Presbyterian, Harlem, and Mt. Sinai); two sites operated in Bronx hospitals (Bronx Municipal and Lincoln); four sites were located at Brooklyn hospitals (Coney Island, East New York, Kings County, and Woodhull); and two sites ran in Queens hospitals (Queens Hospital Teenage Program at South Jamaica Multi-Service Center and Elmhurst). The most established and longest-running Babygram programs were at Lincoln, Mt. Sinai, Queens, and Woodhull. All began operating in 1990-91. Three sites (Bellevue, Columbia Presbyterian, and Elmhurst**) were added in 1991-92. During 1992-93, Babygram sites at Harlem, Bronx Municipal, Coney Island, and Kings County were added and the Babygram program at East New York Hospital began in January 1994.

BABYGRAM PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS' EDUCATIONAL STATUS

OER evaluators utilized information from a sample of case managers' records to compile an educational profile*** of Babygram teens. Consistent with the program goal of identifying pregnant or parenting teens who had dropped out of school or were

---

*The Babygram case manager based at Bellevue Hospital also reported to Gouverneur Hospital one day each week.

**The Babygram program at Elmhurst hospital was suspended in February 1992 and began operating again in December 1993.

***For in-depth demographic profiles of Babygram teen clients, see previous reports.

at risk of dropping out, sample data confirmed that 60 percent (N=340) were long term absentees or had officially been dropped from school rolls.* However, a sizeable group of clients (36 percent, N=203) were actively enrolled in school at the time of initial intake.** Another four percent (N=26) of the clients were high school graduates.

Table 3 indicates the grade (last grade completed and grade at the time of intake) of teen clients and their school status (no longer attending and enrolled). As the table shows, slightly more than one-half (51 percent, N=163) of the teens who dropped out of school had completed no more than ninth grade. Moreover, as program data indicated, 59 percent (N=904) of the Babygram teens had dropped out of school prior to becoming pregnant. Low educational attainment and factors other than pregnancy which account for early school-leaving illustrate the difficulty case managers face in trying to encourage teens to re-enter an educational setting.

On the other hand, as Table 3 also illustrates, 42 percent (N=83) of the Babygram clients who were enrolled in school at the time of intake were attending eleventh or twelfth grade putting them relatively close to graduation. Thus, Babygram case managers play an important role in paving the way for a girl to

---

*Refer to Appendix A for a listing of New York City public high schools last attended by teens who dropped out of school.

**Refer to Appendix B for a listing of the New York City public high schools in which Babygram clients were enrolled at the time of intake.

Table 3

School Attendance Status of Babygram Teens,
by Highest Grade Completed

Grade	Attendance Status: Not Attending School[a] N	%	Attending School[b] N	%
6 or less	7	2	2	1
7	12	4	6	3
8	32	10	17	9
9	112	35	50	25
10	95	30	42	21
11	61	19	56	28
12	0	0	27	14
Total	319	100	200	101

[a] Highest grade completed at time of intake.

[b] Current grade at the time of intake.

- The majority of teens who had dropped out of school prior to meeting with a Babygram case manager had completed ninth grade or less.

continue her education (such as assisting her in transferring schools, making sure a pregnant or parenting teen gets available educational resources, or simply providing encouragement to stay in school).

BABYGRAM RECRUITMENT*

Located in hospitals near prenatal and well-baby care clinics, Babygram case managers were able to identify teens in need of educational services. During an intake interview with the client, case managers assessed clients' educational needs and goals and recorded the information on an intake form. Table 4 shows the average number of intakes per site ranged from 15 to 52.

There were a total of 3,844 new intakes during 1993-94--an average of 350 per site (N=11).** The Babygram objective concerning an increase in the percentage of pregnant and parenting teens served by the project was not met because the average number of new intakes per site was equal to last year's number. It is important to realize that last year's (1992-93) increase in new intakes over the previous year (1991-92) was 17 percent. Because this percentage increase was so large, it may have been difficult for case managers to continue to increase their caseloads.

---

*For a detailed description of recruitment strategies see previous reports.

**Although 12 Babygram sites have been included in this evaluation, an N of 11 was used to calculate the average number of new intakes, referrals and placements for each site. Two sites operated only for half of the year and were, therefore, combined as one site.

Table 4

Comparison of Mean Number of Monthly Intakes by Babygram Site, 1993-94

Hospital	Mean Monthly Intakes*		Average for Year
	Fall 1993	Spring 1994	
Bellevue	23	10	16
Bronx Municipal	23	21	22
Columbia Presbyterian	22	21	21
Coney Island	26	--	26
East New York	--	18	18
Elmhurst	12	17	15
Harlem	23	19	21
Kings County	53	28	40
Lincoln	33	30	31
Mount Sinai	66	31	47
Queens	66	36	40
Woodhull	58	47	52
Average number of intakes per site	34	23	27

*The mean number of monthly intakes is derived by averaging the number of new intakes for October through January (fall 1993) and February through June (spring, 1994).

- The average number of intakes ranged from 15 to 52.
- On average, case managers had 27 new intakes per month.

BABYGRAM PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

The 1993-94 proposal stated that the staff development training provided by Bank Street College of Education conducted in 1992-93 would be implemented again during the 1993-94 program year. Objectives stated that 15 hospital staff members would receive training in parenting skills and each hospital staff member trained would implement at least one parenting activity or workshop for project participants. Because of budgetary program cuts, these components of the Babygram program were eliminated.

III. EDUCATIONAL REFERRALS AND PLACEMENT

RETURN PARTICIPANTS

Consistent with the program goal of returning parents to an educational setting, case managers referred parents to a variety of programs that would best suit their clients' needs and skills* OER obtained placement information on a sample of 278 parents and determined that 85 percent of these parents were enrolled in some type of educational setting during the program year. This represents a substantial increase in the percent of parents entering educational programs over last year when 73 percent were placed. Parents who were not enrolled were either expected to enroll at a later date, could not be placed in an appropriate program, were on a waiting list or did not wish to enroll.

Table 5 presents information, based on aggregated monthly summary statistics provided by the program office, on the number and percent of parents enrolled in educational programs. As can be seen in the table, ABE and G.E.D. programs accounted for over one-half (55 percent, N=348) of all programs parents were placed in. This represents a substantial decrease from the previous program year when placements in ABE and G.E.D. programs accounted for 70 percent of all placements. A lower percentage of parents (23 percent, N=143) entered G.E.D. program in 1993-94 compared

---

*Actual numbers of referrals made by Return case managers are not collected by the program office and are therefore unavailable.

Table 5

Number and Percent of Return School Parents Placed in Educational Programs and on Waiting Lists, by Type of Program

	Parents Placed		Parents Wait-Listed	
Program	N	%	N	%
ABE	205	32	121	30
G.E.D.	143	23	170	42
Vocational Training	68	11	17	4
Job Placement	67	10	48	12
E.S.L.	62	10	32	8
Literacy	62	10	18	4
High School	28	4	--	--
Total Parents	635	100*	406	100

- ABE and G.E.D. placements accounted for over one-half of all program placements.
- More parents were placed on waiting lists for G.E.D. programs than for any other program.

to the previous two program years (36 percent in 1992-93 and 28 percent in 1991-92). In addition, this decrease in G.E.D. placements did not necessarily translate into increased numbers of parents placed on G.E.D. waiting lists. The percentage wait-listed has remained fairly constant at about 30 percent since 1991-92. This finding may indicate that as on-site G.E.D. programs close, parents simply do not attempt to enroll in other programs.

OER found that parents were much more likely to enroll in a program on-site (i.e., a program that operates on the school grounds) than in an independent program off the school premises. Sample data reported in Table 6 clearly show the tendency of parents to enroll in on-site ABE and G.E.D. programs.

Not all parents, however, were able to enter educational programs because of lack of openings. Table 5 also shows the number and percentage of parents placed on waiting lists. As the table indicates, most parents (72 percent, N=291) on waiting lists were waiting to enter ABE or G.E.D. programs.

The Return objective concerning program participation and tracking stipulated that at least 30 percent of all program participants would remain in an educational program for at least one month. Data to assess this objective were not available at the time this report was prepared. They will be reported at a later time through an addendum. Nevertheless, because many aspects of Project Return have remained consistent throughout the years of the program, there is no reason to believe that this

Table 6

Percentage Ratios of Return Parents
Enrolled in On-site vs. Off-site
Educational Programs

Educational Program	On-Site N	On-Site %	Off-Site N	Off-Site %
ABE	107	94	7	6
G.E.D.	49	78	14	22
E.S.L.	6	43	8	57

- Return parents were much more likely to enroll in on-site A.B.E. or G.E.D. educational programs that operate within the Return elementary school than those that operate outside of the school.

objective will not be met. This is likely particularly since over one-half (51 percent) of the parents who were enrolled in a program last year remained for at least one month.

BABYGRAM PARTICIPANTS

After the initial intake interview, case managers attempted to make appropriate educational referrals for clients who wished assistance. During the 1993-94 program year, case managers referred 1,840 young teens to various educational settings and programs--an average of 180 referrals per site (N=11). This represents a decrease as compared with the previous year's average of 208 referrals. Thus, the program objective that the average number of referrals would increase during 1993-94 was not met.

However, not all clients were ready to re-enter school. Sample data indicated that approximately one-third (34 percent, N=189) of the new clients did not request an educational referral. Over one-half (53 percent, N=91) of those were already attending school and were not, therefore, in need of a referral. Case managers cited other reasons for teen clients not requesting referrals such as wanting to wait until after the baby's birth (16 percent, N=27), lack of boyfriend, husband or family support to return to an educational setting (six percent, N=27), disinterest in returning to school (six percent, N=11), wishing to postpone enrollment (five percent, N=8) and other reasons (15 percent, N=25) ranging from illness to homelessness.

Using aggregated monthly program statistics, evaluators determined that when case managers did make a referral on behalf of a client, approximately one-third (30 percent, N=666) of the referrals were to G.E.D./ABE programs and slightly more than one-fourth (28 percent, N=556) were to 900 schools,* followed by referrals to high schools (18 percent, N=274).** Appendix C provides a list of the number of teens who were referred to each high school by superintendency. Generally, the percentage of referrals to 900 schools and G.E.D. programs has been consistent since 1991-92 (28, 32, and 30 percent respectively). Table 7 presents a breakdown of the type of educational referrals made.

After an educational referral was made on behalf of a client, it was hoped that the client would follow through and eventually enroll in a program or re-enroll in school. Based on monthly program statistics, case mangers verified the placement of 1,163 teens. In other words, 59 percent of teens who received referrals were placed--an increase of 8 percentage points over the previous year. This successfully fulfills the program objective which stipulated that the percentage of pregnant or parenting adolescents placed in educational programs would increase in 1993-94.

---

*For the purposes of this report, Schools for Pregnant and Parenting Teens (Family Centers) are referred to as P900 schools. There are five schools in the Pregnant Teen program located in Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens.

**See Appendix C for a listing of N.Y.C. public high schools to which Babygram clients were referred.

Table 7

Number and Percent of Educational Referrals in Babygram Population Data, by Program Type

	Referrals for Teens	
Educational Program	N	Percent
P900 Schools	556	28
Alternative High Schools	226	12
High Schools	274	18
Junior High Schools	81	4
G.E.D./ABE Programs	666	30
Job Training	172	9
Total	1,975	101*

*Does not add to 100 due to rounding.

- More than one-half of the clients (58 percent) were referred to programs that lead to a high school diploma.

Table 8 illustrates the percentage breakdown of teens placed during 1993-94 by type of school. While G.E.D. programs accounted for the largest percentage of referrals, as seen in Table 8, such programs had the lowest placement rate (40 percent). Table 8 also provides a comparison of placement ratios for all three program years. In general, the placement rates have remained fairly constant with two exceptions. During 1993-94, 900 schools successfully placed over half of the teens referred, the highest percentage of all three years; and, regular high schools had the lowest percentage of placements of all three years. Appendix D provides a list of public high schools by superintendency and the number of teens who were placed in each following a case manager's referral.

Table 8

Comparison of Placement Rates, by Type of Program
1991-92, 1992-93, and 1993-94

	Percent of Referrals Who Were Placed		
Type of Placement	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94
P900 Schools	50%	48%	58%
Alternative H.S.	57	57	62
Regular H.S.	64	75	61
Junior H.S.	--	69	63
G.E.D.	42	37	40
Job Training	59	44	61
Total Percentage	52%	51%	59%

- The placement rate (percentage of teens who subsequently enrolled in a school or program after a referral) was higher for 1993-94 than for any other program year.
- Placement rates for 900 schools and alternative high schools increased in 1993-94.

IV. PROGRAM OUTCOMES

PROJECT RETURN EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENT OUTCOMES

OER obtained information on end-of-year outcomes for 99 percent of the sample (N=276). Return case managers contacted participants by phone or letter (30 percent, N=84) or spoke directly to parents at their Return sites (70 percent, N=192) to verify the parent's status vis-a-vis their program participation or educational plans as of June 15, 1994. Case managers' aggressive efforts in determining the outcome of parent participants has yielded a comprehensive look at the program for the second consecutive year. This suggests that case managers have successfully implemented a viable tracking system of their parent participants' progress and plans.

Overall, year-end outcomes have remained fairly consistent from year to year as Table 9 indicates. However, a slightly higher percentage of parents (77 percent, N=179) had favorable outcomes during 1993-94 than during the previous year (70 percent, N=146). A closer look reveals somewhat fewer G.E.D.s received (three percent) in 1993-94 than in previous years (seven percent for both years); however, placement in G.E.D. programs was the lowest ever in 1993-94. On the other hand, a higher percentage of parents were promoted to higher levels or grades or maintained enrollment in programs than in 1993-94. Moreover, the percentage of parents who withdrew before the year's end was lower than in previous years.

Table 9

Year-End Summary of Reported Outcomes
for a Sample of Return Parents Enrolled
in an Educational Program

Outcome of Parents as of June 15, 1994	Parents					
	1993-94		1992-93		1991-92	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Received high school diploma or G.E.D. certificate	6	3	15	7	9	7
Awaiting G.E.D. results or test date	17	7	10	5	13	11
Promoted to next or higher level or grade	54	23	44	21	23	19
Maintained Enrollment	102	44	77	37	54	45
Secured employment	13	6	21	10	11	9
Withdrew from program	29	12	40	19	11	9
Total Parents	233	100	207	99*	121	100

*Percentage does not equal 100 due to rounding.

- Almost three-fourths (71 percent) of the parents who enrolled in an educational program and for whom data were available received their high school or equivalency diploma, were promoted to a higher level, or maintained satisfactory progress on the same level.

Of the 15 percent (N=43) who did not enroll in an educational setting, 12 did not wish placement, six were expected to enroll the following year, eight could not be placed and 17 were not placed for various other reasons.

PROJECT RETURN PROGRAM IMPACTS

Self-Esteem and Locus of Control

A primary goal of Project Return is to enhance participants' self-image and provide them with skills that promote a feeling of control over their lives. The assumption is that parents who feel good about themselves and their ability to control their own lives are more likely to invest in their own and their children's education. Therefore, OER evaluators looked at two psychological characteristics, self-esteem and locus of control.

A six-item self-esteem scale (adapted from the longer Self-Esteem Scale by Rosenberg)* and a five-item locus of control (an adapted version of Rotter) were administered by Return case managers to new client intakes at the start of the program year (September and October) and again to the same individuals at the close of the program year (June), identified only through the

---

*An abridged version of the Rosenberg (1965) self-esteem scale and the Rotter (1966) locus of control scale were chosen for administration ease. Many program participants did not have literacy skills that would enable them to complete the longer versions of the scales. The adapted self-esteem and locus of control instruments were first used by evaluators of the Project Redirection program. (See Polit, Denise, et.al. Needs and Characteristics of Pregnant and Parenting Teens: The Baseline Report for Project Redirection, MDRC, May 1982.) The principal evaluator of Project Redirection explained in a phone conversation with OER that the items chosen on the adapted versions of both instruments had a high internal consistency of .80.

last three digits of their social security numbers or other identifying codes developed by the case managers. Self-esteem scores on this instrument could range from six (low levels of self-esteem) to 24. Locus of control scores could range from five (feelings of lack of control over life events) to a high of 20 (indicating belief in controlling one's own outcomes). For several reasons including program attrition, parent concerns about being identified, and incorrect code numbers, OER was unable to match pre-and post-tests of individuals to determine mean gains. Although self-esteem and locus of control gains are unavailable, OER compared Project Return parents' post-test scores on both the self-esteem and locus of control scales, as a group, to the post-test results of a somewhat similar group of participants in a different program in order to get some sense of where the Return sample stood on these measures in relation to another similar group. The comparison data used for this analysis derived from a 1982 national study down on Project Redirection participants. Project Redirection and Project Return participants were similar in characteristics in a number of ways: both were female, most had not completed high school, and all had young children. Project Redirection participants, however, were teenagers while the majority of Project Return participants were between the ages of 22 and 35 years old.

In Table 10, the comparison of Project Return participants' post-test self-esteem and locus of control results with Project Redirection's experimental and control groups' post-test results

Table 10

Project Return Parents' Self-Esteem
and Locus of Control End-of-Year Mean Scores

	Mean Scores[1]		
Scale	Project Return Experimental	Project Redirection Experimental	Control
Self-Esteem	19.56	19.76	19.17
Locus of Control	15.33	14.89	14.42

[1] Mean scores were calculated from the results of the tests that were administered at the end of the program.

- Project Return parents scored slightly higher on self-esteem at the end of the program year than Project Redirection's control group at program end.
- At program end, Project Return parents slightly scored higher on locus of control than Project Redirection's experimental and control groups.

is presented. As the table indicates, as a group, the self-esteem post-test results of Return parents were virtually identical to the scores of the Redirection participants (19.56 versus 19.76). This is true even though Redirection teens spent an average of two years in their program, while Return parents only participated in Project Return for one year.

Table 10 also shows that Project Return parents' mean locus of control scores were slightly higher than either those of the Redirection experimental or control groups (15.33 versus 14.89 and 14.42).

Because of the difficulties in the pre-post-test design, OER was unable to determine whether participants demonstrated an increase in self-esteem as stated by the objective concerning self-esteem. However, through the use of comparison data, it does appear that participation in Project Return was associated with at least as high levels of self-confidence and beliefs in having control over one's life events as students from other similar groups.

Parenting Skills Training

In order to assess the effectiveness of the parenting skills instruction offered by Project Return through various workshops and classes, Return case managers administered the Parent as a Teacher Test (PAAT)* to parents at the start and close of the program year by Return case managers.

---

*Strom, Robert. Parent as a Teacher Inventory. Bensenville, Ill., 1984.

The PAAT, available in both English and Spanish, is a standardized test that reveals what individual mothers and fathers expect of their children, aged three to nine, and how they perceive themselves as teachers of their children. The test is comprised of 50 items, each followed by a four-point scale. A higher score indicates a parent who gives the more desirable answers based on child development research, values his/her role as the child's teacher, encourages play and creativity, and is not over-controlling. The test was administered in English and Spanish as appropriate.

As was the case with the self-esteem and locus of control administration, OER was unable to match individuals' pre-and post-tests in order to determine mean gains to assess the program's evaluation objective. Nevertheless, OER has compared Return parents' mean PAAT score with those of two other groups of parents. Table 11 presents Project Return parents' mean pre-test score compared to the comparison groups. Unfortunately, post-test comparison scores were not available. However, the mean post-test score for Project Return parents (140.36) exceeds the pre-test scores for the two comparison groups. Because of the lack of pre- and post-test data, OER was unable to determine whether participants demonstrated increased knowledge related to the content of the parenting skills curriculum. However, in relation to other groups, Return participants' post-test mean score suggests that there might have been some knowledge gain.

Table 11

Comparison of Pre-test
Mean PAAT Scores

Population[a]	Pre-test PAAT Means
Project Return Parents	132.4
PACE Project Parents[b]	136.7
Mothers of Second Grade Children Phoenix, Arizona[c]	139.0

[a]See Strom, R.D., and Slaughter, H. "Measurement of Childrearing Expectations Using the Parent as a Teacher Inventory," Journal of Experimental Education, 1978, 46 (4), 44-53 for detailed descriptions of the comparison groups.

[b]Title I Parent and Child Education Project, Tucson, Arizona.

[c]Washington School District, Phoenix, Arizona.

- Although post-test mean scores were not available for the comparison groups, the post-test mean for Project Return parents of 140.36 exceeded the pre-test mean scores of other project parents.

The Effect of Parents' Program Participation on Their Children

In order to assess the impact of parents' participation in Project Return on their elementary school children (grades two through five), OER compared Spring 1993 reading and mathematics scores of children whose parents received Project Return services and children whose parents did not. Return case managers had supplied OER with the names of children in grades two through five of "core group" Return parents (parent participants who regularly attended workshops and classes), names of children whose parents received some services, but did not attend workshops and classes on a regular basis, and names of children whose parents made initial contact with a case manager, but never returned for services.

OER then compared the spring 1993 mean scores on the Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) test and the spring 1993 California Achievement Test in mathematics (CAT) of the three groups of children. Reading and math scores are reported in the form of Normal Curve Equivalents (N.C.E.s), norm-referenced scores which indicate how students performed in relation to a national norming sample--i.e., students in the same grade in a nationally representative sample who took the test. Since N.C.E.s are based on an equal interval scale, they can be used for arithmetic and statistical calculations, and to compare scores across grade levels.

In order to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences between the scores of the three different groups of children, *t*-tests were conducted.

Comparison of N.C.E. reading and mathematics scores for children (N=40) whose parents were considered by case managers as active participants ("core group parents") and children whose parents received no intervention are presented in Table 12. As this table shows, the reading and mathematics N.C.E. scores of children of actively attending parents were significantly higher ($p < .05$) than for children of non-participating parents. Furthermore, as summarized in Table 13, reading and mathematics achievement was significantly higher among children of parents who received limited intervention compared to children of parents who received no program services. Therefore, even some program participation by Return parents seemed to have a positive effect on their childrens' academic achievement.

BABYGRAM HOSPITAL OUTREACH EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENT OUTCOMES

Case managers provided follow-up and continuing support for clients so that they could be successful in their educational programs. Similar to the previous program year when a rigorous follow-up system was implemented, case managers obtained information on the status of 91 percent (N=542) of their clients at the end of the program year. The sample of case manager records provided outcome information as of June 15, 1994 for 353 Babygram clients.*

---

*This figure only includes the year-end outcomes for clients who were actually referred to educational settings by case managers.

Table 12

Comparison of Spring 1993 Reading and Mathematics N.C.E.s of Students[a] of Project Return Parents and Non-Return Parents

Subject	Group 1[b] N	Group 1[b] Mean	Group 1[b] S.D.	Group 3[c] N	Group 3[c] Mean	Group 3[c] S.D.	t value
Reading	40	37.9	16.8	42	30.8	16.7	1.92*
Mathematics	40	42.4	16.1	40	35.6	14.5	1.98*

[a]N.C.E.s are based on an equal interval scale and can be used to compare across grade levels. For the purposes of this analysis, students in grades two through five have been combined into one group.

[b]Parents of students in Group 1 participated in Project Return for ten months and were considered by case managers as "core group" participants.

[c]Parents of students in Group 3 made initial contact with a Project Return case manager but did not return, and, therefore, received no intervention.

*$p<.05$

- Reading and mathematics achievement was significantly higher among students whose parents participated in Project Return ($p < .05$) than among students whose parents did not participate in Project Return.

Table 13

Comparison of Spring 1993 Reading and Mathematics N.C.E.s of Students[a] of Project Return Parents and Non-Return Parents

Subject	Group[b] N	Group[b] Mean	Group[b] S.D.	Group[c] N	Group[c] Mean	Group[c] S.D.	t value
Reading	68	39.3	20.4	42	30.8	16.7	2.37*
Mathematics	68	41.5	21.1	40	35.6	14.5	1.73

[a]N.C.E.s are based on an equal interval scale and can be used to compare across grade levels. For the purposes of this analysis, student in grades two through five have been combined into one group.

[b]Parents of students in Group 2 participated in Project Return activities and received some program intervention, but were not considered by case managers as "core group" participants.

[c]Parents of students in Group 3 made initial contact with a Project Return case manager but did not return, and, therefore, received no intervention.

*$p<.05$

- Reading achievement was significantly higher among children of "core group" parent participants than children whose parents did not participate fully in Project Return.

Table 14 provides a three-year comparison of outcomes for Babygram clients who were actually enrolled in an educational setting. As seen in the table, the outcomes have remained fairly constant during the three program years with slight variations.

Table 15 indicates the year-end outcomes of teens referred to and subsequently enrolled in 900 schools, regular high schools* and G.E.D. programs. According to this sample data, teens attending regular high schools were more likely to be promoted to the next grade or maintain enrollment. Teens attending 900 schools were more likely to withdraw before June 30. In addition, clients referred to G.E.D. programs were far more likely to postpone enrollment until the following school year than any other referrals.

BABYGRAM TEEN LONGITUDINAL STUDY

Program staff requested that OER track Babygram teens who had been referred to New York City public schools (includes junior high and intermediate schools, regular and alternative high schools, 900 schools, and Board of Education special schools and programs) to determine their status as of June 1994. Babygram teens from the four longest-running and most established Babygram sites were chosen for follow-up: Lincoln, Mt. Sinai, Queens and Woodhull. Case managers were requested to provide OER with a list of names of all teens referred to public schools or programs for 1990-91, 1991-92, and 1992-93.

---

*See Appendix D for a listing of New York City high schools in which Babygram teens enrolled.

Table 14

Year-End Summary of Reported Outcomes for Babygram Sample, 1991-92, 1992-93, and 1993-94

Status of Client as of June 30	1991-92		1992-93		1993-94	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Received H.S. Diploma or G.E.D.	12	11	23	8	15	8
Promoted to Higher Level or Grade	59	52	103	37	55	29
Remained on Same Level or Grade	17	15	90	32	71	37
Awaiting G.E.D. Test Date/Results	20	18	35	13	19	10
Secured Employment	3	2	4	1	5	3
Withdrew from Program	3	2	24	9	27	14
Total	114	100	279	100	192	101*

*Percentage does not equal 100 due to rounding.

- Outcomes for the three program years have remained fairly consistent.

Table 15

Year-End Outcomes of Babygram Teens,
by Type of Referral, 1993-94

	Type of Referral					
	P900 School		Regular H.S.		G.E.D.	
Outcome as June 30, 1994	N	%	N	%	N	%
Received H.S./G.E.D. Diploma	3	4	4	7	2	2
Waiting for G.E.D. Test Date or Results	-		-		15	19
Promoted to Next or Higher Grade or Level	16	19	26	42	2	2
Maintained Enrollment	28	34	15	25	22	27
Withdrew from Program	13	16	3	5	5	6
Expected to Enroll Fall 1994	11	13	5	7	27	33
Wait Listed	6	7	4	7	7	9
Could Not Be Placed	6	7	4	7	1	1
Total	83	100	61	100	81	99

- Teens enrolled in regular high schools were more likely to be promoted to the next grade than teens enrolled in 900 schools.
- Babygram teens who were referred to G.E.D. programs were more likely to postpone enrollment.

Case managers provided OER evaluators with 850 names of teens referred to N.Y.C. public schools. Evaluators chose a 30 percent (N=261) random sample for follow-up in the on-line database of New York City public school children. OER determined that 26 percent (N=67) of the teens in the sample did not enroll in a school or program subsequent to referral. Of the teens who did enroll (74 percent, N=194), 46 had made initial contact with a case manager during the 1990-91 school year, 87 during the 1992-93 school year, and 61 during the 1992-93 school year.

Table 16 provides an overview of OER findings on the current educational status of Babygram teens referred to public schools during the three previous program years. As was expected, a higher percentage (26 percent, N=12) of teens from the 1990-91 program year graduated from high school or received their G.E.D.s than the other two years (17 percent and seven percent respectively) simply because they have had more time to complete their schooling. Also as expected, a lower percentage of teens (28 percent, N=13) from that year were currently enrolled in a school or program while almost one-half (49 percent, N=50) of the teens referred in 1992-93 were actively attending school.

As Table 16 also indicates, approximately one-third of the sample teens had been discharged as of June 30, 1994. Teens referred in 1990-91 had a lower dropout rate than the other two program years. A possible explanation is that since this analysis only focused on the current (i.e., as of 1994)

Table 16

Educational Status of Babygram Teens For Three Years
1990-91, 1991-92, 1992-93

As of June 30, 1994	Program Year 1990-91 N	%	1991-92 N	%	1992-93 N	%	All Years N	%
Completed High School	12	16	15[b]	17	4	7	31	26
Graduated	(2)[a]		(9)		(2)		(13)	
Received G.E.D.	(12)		(6)		(2)		(18)	
Active Attendance	12	26	35	40	28	46	75	39
Enrolled in Special Program	1	2	5	6	2	3	8	4
Board of Education program	(0)		(4)		(2)		(6)	
Full-time equivalent outside N.Y.C. public system	(1)		(1)		(0)		(2)	
Dropped Out	14	30	30	34	24	39	68	35
Not found	(2)		(3)		(3)		(8)	
Over 17 years old	(11)		(26)		(21)		(58)	
Over 21 years old	(1)		(1)		(0)		(2)	
Moved Out of N.Y.C.	7	15	2	2	3	5	12	6
Total	46	99	87	99	61	100	194	100

[a] Includes one high school local diploma
[b] Includes one full-time employment certificate, one I.E.P. Special Education diploma, and three day high school local diplomas.

- Overall, the majority of Babygram teens (59 percent) either received a high school diploma or G.E.D. or was in active attendance.

educational status of referred teens, teens referred during the first program year may have dropped out and re-enrolled whereas teens referred during later years may not have re-enrolled as yet.

Overall, then, the follow-up of Babygram teens, portrays a positive trend. The majority (59 percent, N=114) of teens referred by case managers to New York City Board of Education programs or schools have either graduated or are currently enrolled while approximately one-third (35 percent, N=68) of the sample teens had dropped out subsequent to enrollment.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report described the range of activities planned and carried out at each of the seven Return and 12 Babygram sites, as well as educational case mangagement referral and placement processes, and selected outcomes. Utilizing data supplied from the Return program office and from a sample of parent and teen clients obtained from case managers' records, OER determined that the program was successful in meeting its main goals--to identify parents or teens who had dropped out of school and to assist them in returning to educational settings.

Although the percentage of new client intakes did not increase from the previous program year in either Return or Babygram, there were substantial increases in the percentage of parents or teens who entered educational programs. Eighty-five percent of OER's sample of Return parents were enrolled in educational programs, an increase from 73 percent the previous year. Similarly, 59 percent of the Babygram clients in OER's sample who had been referred to an educational setting actually enrolled, reflecting an increase over the previous year of 51 percent.

Overall, year-end outcomes for participants in both program components has remained constant since 1992-93. Approximately three-fourths of the parents who were placed in educational settings, completed their program, or maintained satisfactory progress, and many of the Return parents were involved in the workshops offered at the Return sites. Similarly, of the

Babygram teens who enrolled in an educational program during the three program years, approximately three-fourths, received a high school diploma or G.E.D., were promoted to a higher grade or level, or maintained satisfactory progress.

In order to assess the long-term impact of the Babygram case managers' successful efforts in referring and placing pregnant and parenting teens in educational settings, OER tracked a sample of Babygram teens who had been referred to New York City public schools to determine their status as of June 1994. OER determined that, of the teens who enrolled in New York City public schools, the majority had either graduated or were actively enrolled as of June 1994. However, after re-enrolling with the assistance of the Babygram case managers, over one-third of the clients dropped out of school prior to graduation.

Both Return and Babygram case managers provided services to program participants that are not directly measurable. For example, Return case managers found it necessary to help participants meet many other needs before focusing on their educational needs and often made social service contacts particularly in the area of health. Moreover, case managers attempted to educate their participants in self-advocacy skills (telephoning for information, making appointments, arranging transportation, etc.). In addition, Babygram case managers played an important role in encouraging teen clients who were pregnant or parenting to remain in school often assisting in school transfers to more appropriate programs or acting as a

liaison between school counselors and the teen herself. In both instances, educational case managers functioned, not only as facilitators in assisting a client to return to an educational setting, but also as advocates who provided on-going educational and emotional support for a parent or teen to improve their lives.

Based on these findings, OER offers the following recommendations:

- Given the success educational case managers have had in placing clients in educational settings, Project Return should review its recruitment processes in order to increase the number of new clients to be served.
- Project Return should expand its program of formal training for case managers to enable them to meet the many and complex needs of their clients.
- Project Return should explore ways to better plan, implement, and evaluate additional program components such as staff development activities and participant enrichment workshops.
- Project Return should strengthen its relationships with school staff in N.Y.C. public high schools, particularly those that enroll the most Babygram teen clients since clients experience many difficulties in making the transition to school life and may need a variety of additional services.

APPENDIX A

Frequency of High Schools Last Attended
by Teens Who Dropped Out, by Superintendency

Superintendency/High School	Number of Teens Who Dropped Out
Manhattan	
Louis D. Brandeis	9
Washington Irving	5
Julia Richman	5
Park West	5
Seward Park	4
Norman Thomas	4
Fashion Industries	3
Wadleigh	2
George Washington	2
Martin Luther King, Jr.	2
Murray Bergtraum	2
Center for Continued Education	2
West Side	1
Lower East Side Prep	1
Satellite Academy	1
H.S. of Teaching	1
Graphic Communication Arts	1
Mabel D. Bacon	1
Bronx	
Morris	10
James Monroe	8
Evander Childs	8
William H. Taft	6
Adlai E. Stevenson	6
John F. Kennedy	6
Walton	5
DeWitt Clinton	4
Christopher Columbus	2
Theodore Roosevelt	2
Jane Addams	2
Grace H. Dodge	2
Herbert H. Lehman	1
William H. Taft G.E.D.	1
Bronx H.S. of Science	1
Harry S. Truman	1
South Bronx	1
Bronx Regional	1

(continued)

APPENDIX A (continued)

Frequency of High Schools Last Attended
by Teens Who Dropped Out, by Superintendency

Superintendency/High School	Number of Teens Who Dropped Out
Brooklyn	
Alfred E. Smith	1
Samuel Gompers	1
Boys and Girls	9
Eastern District	9
Erasmus	6
Prospect Heights	4
George W. Wingate	3
Bushwick	3
Midwood	2
Franklin K. Lane	2
New Utrecht	2
Sheepshead Bay	2
Canarsie	2
Clara Barton	2
Harry Van Arsdale	2
William H. Maxwell	2
Teen Aid	2
Lafayette	1
Abraham Lincoln	1
Samuel J. Tilden	1
Brooklyn Technical	1
John Jay	1
Franklin D. Roosevelt	1
South Shore	1
Street Academy Middle College	1
William E. Grady	1
Paul Robeson	1
Queens	
Andrew Jackson	8
Newtown	4
Jamaica	4
William C. Bryant	3
Flushing	3
Ida B. Wells	3
Beach Channel	2

(continued)

APPENDIX A (continued)

Frequency of High Schools Last Attended
by Teens Who Dropped Out, by Superintendency

Superintendency/High School	Number of Teens Who Dropped Out
Queens	
Springfield Gardens	2
John Bowne	2
Grover Cleveland	2
August Martin	1
Martin Van Buren	1
Richmond Hill	1
John Adams	1
Queens Comprehensive Night School	1
Hillcrest	1
Middle College	1

APPENDIX B

Frequency of N.Y.C. Public
High Schools Where Teens Were
Actively Attending At the Time of Intake, by
High School Superintendency

Superintendency/ High School	Number of Teens Attending
Manhattan	
Louis D. Brandeis	6
Martin Luther King, Jr.	6
Center for Continued Education	5
George Washington	4
Park West	4
Fashion Industries	4
Julia Richman	3
Seward Park	2
East Side Community	1
Washington Irving	1
George Washington G.E.D.	1
Park East	1
West Side	1
Lower East Side Prep.	1
A. Philip Randolph	1
Central Park East	1
Satellite Academy	1
Norman Thomas	1
Mabel D. Bacon	1
Bronx	
William H. Taft	5
Grace H. Dodge	4
Walton	3
Theodore Roosevelt	3
John F. Kennedy	3
James Monroe	2
Evander Childs	2
DeWitt Clinton	2
Jane Addams	2
Martha Neilson	2
Morris	1
Herbert H. Lehman	1
Adlai E. Stevenson	1

(continued)

APPENDIX B (continued)

Frequency of N.Y.C. Public
High Schools Where Teens Were
Actively Attending At the Time of Intake, by
High School Superintendency

Superintendency/ High School	Number of Teens Attending
Brooklyn	
Harry S. Truman	1
Bronx Regional	1
Eastern District	6
Erasmus Hall	4
Samuel J. Tilden	3
Bushwick	3
William H. Maxwell	3
Teen Aid	3
Lafayette	2
Midwood	2
Boys and Girls	2
George W. Wingate	2
Sheepshead Bay	2
South Shore	2
Franklin K. Lane	1
Prospect Heights	1
John Jay	1
Canarsie	1
Street Academy	1
Automotive	1
William E. Grady	1
Harry Van Arsdale	1
Community School for Comprehensive Education	1
Queens	
Ida B. Wells	6
Aviation	4
Jamaica	3
August Martin	2
John Bowne	2
William C. Bryant	2
Long Island City	2
Newtown	2
Benjamin Cardozo	1

(continued)

APPENDIX B (continued)

Frequency of N.Y.C. Public
High Schools Where Teens Were
Actively Attending At the Time of Intake, by
High School Superintendency

Superintendency/ High School	Number of Teens Attending
Springfield Gardens	1
Martin Van Buren	1
Bayside	1
Thomas A. Edison	1

APPENDIX C

Frequency of N.Y.C. Public High Schools Teens Were Referred to, by High School Superintendency

Superintendency/High School	Number of Teens Referred
Manhattan	
Center for Continued Education	34
Murry Bergtraum	3
Satellite Academy	3
George Washington	2
Washington Irving	1
Upper Manhattan Outreach	1
Lower Manhattan Outreach	1
Auxiliary Services	1
Park West	1
Mabel D. Bacon	1
Bronx	
Martha Nielson	39
Morris GED	2
William Taft	1
Taft GED	1
Evander Childs	1
Adlai E. Steveson	1
Harry Truman	1
South Bronx	1
Brooklyn	
Teen Aid	17
Community School for Comp. Ed.	12
Prospect Heights	6
George Wingate	5
Samuel Tilden	4
Street Academy	4
James Madison	3
Clara Barton	3
Sarah Hale	3
Midwood	2
South Shore	2
Franklin K. Lane	1
Brooklyn Tech	1

(continued)

APPENDIX C (continued)

Frequency of N.Y.C. Public High Schools
Teens Were Referred to, by
High School Superintendency

Superintendency/High School	Number of Teens Referred
Brooklyn	
John Jay	1
Erasmus	1
Bushwick	1
Sheepshead Bay	1
Canarsie	1
H.S. for Redirection	1
Brooklyn Comp. Night School	1
East New York-Transit School	1
Paul Robeson	1
Queens	
Ida B. Wells	20
Middle College	3
Martin Van Buren	3
Jamaica	2
John Adams GED	2
Andrew Jackson	2
Queesn Comp. Nigh School	2
Hillcrest	2
Beach Channel	1
Springfield Gardens	1
John Bowne	1
Andrew Jackson GED	1

APPENDIX D

Frequency of N.Y.C. Public High Schools
Teens Enrolled In After Referral by
a Case Manager, by Superintendency

Superintendency/High School	Number of Teens Enrolled
Manhattan	
Center for Continued Education	21
George Washington	3
Murry Bergtraum	3
Satellite Academy	3
Washington Irving	1
Upper Manhattan Outreach	1
Lower Manhattan Outreach	1
Auxiliary Services	1
Park West	1
Mabel D. Bacon	1
Bronx	
Martha Nielson	9
Morris GED	1
Taft	1
Taft GED	1
Evander Childs	1
Dewitt Clinton	1
Adlai E. Stevenson	1
Harry S. Truman	1
South Bronx	1
Brooklyn	
Prospect Heights	5
Community School for Comp. Ed.	5
Samuel Tilden	4
George Wingate	4
Teen Aid	4
Clara Barton	3
Sarah Hale	3
Midwood	2
James Madison	2
Sheepshead Bay	2
South Shore	2

(continued)

APPENDIX D (continued)

Frequency of N.Y.C. Public High School Teens Enrolled After Referral by a Case Manager, by Superintendency

Superintendency/High School	Number of Teens Enrolled
Brooklyn	
H.S. Redirection	2
Street Academy	2
Franklin K. Lane	1
Brooklyn Tech	1
John Jay	1
Erasmus	1
Eastern District	1
Bushwick	1
Canarsie	1
Brooklyn Comp. Night School	1
East New York-Transit Tech	1
Queens	
Ida B. Wells	18
Middle College	3
Martin Van Buren	2
Jamaica	2
Queens Comp. Night School	2
Beach Channel	1
Springfield Gardens	1
John Bowne	1
William Bryant	1
Andrew Jackson	1
Hillcrest	1